

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



Department of
Agriculture

Office of
Governmental
and Public Affairs

Major News Releases and Speeches

Feb. 26 - March 5, 1982

IN THIS ISSUE:

Speech—

Remarks prepared for delivery by Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block, before the Paul A. Funk Recognition Program, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, March 1, 1982

Remarks prepared for delivery by Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block at the Western States Dairy Conference, in Seattle, Washington, March 3, 1982

Testimony—

Statement By Seeley Lodwick, Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs, United States Department of Agriculture, before the Senate Committee on Finance, Subcommittee on International Trade, March 1, 1982

News Releases—

State Shares of 1982 National Forest System Revenues Estimated at \$205 Million

Block Names New Food and Nutrition Service Administrator

CCC Loan Interest Rate Increased

USDA Protects 16 New Seed Varieties

300 Youths and Adults to Help Chart Future Directions of 4-H

Easter Winterfeldt to Head Human Nutrition Information Service

USDA to Assess Impact of Transportation Deregulation on Agriculture

Dairy Symposium Set for March 22 - 23

Khapra Beetle Infestation Found in New Jersey Warehouse

USDA to End 24-Hour Infoline Reporting Test April 1

USDA Releases Cost of Food at Home for January 1982

Speeches

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Governmental and Public Affairs

Remarks prepared for delivery by Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block, before the Paul A. Funk Recognition Program, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, March 1, 1982

It is a great honor for me...a privilege to be here today to take part in this very worthwhile event—the 1982 Paul A. Funk Recognition Award Program.

I am also happy to have the opportunity to personally congratulate your distinguished award winners. They have made a great contribution to agriculture, and it is appropriate that they be recognized here today. What they have accomplished thus far is commendable in itself. But the greater feats are still to come as they, and those who follow, build upon the foundations of their achievements.

It is always a pleasure for me to return to Illinois, but even more so now as we find ourselves standing on the threshold of spring. I have eaten...breathed...lived and died with agriculture all of my life, as I still do today. And even while I am living in Washington, D.C., my thoughts still turn toward the fields this time of year...when the cruelest part of winter is past, and you just know that it won't be long before a handful of soil feels warm to your touch.

The name of Paul A. Funk also serves as a warm reminder of life on my Illinois farm. The Funk name has been equated with agriculture for as long as I can recall. He was a lifelong advocate of this industry, and I am happy to see this carried on by the Paul A. Funk Foundation and your College of Agriculture at the University of Illinois.

Today I want to talk with you about science and education and its role, as I see it, in shaping the future of agriculture and the vast food and fiber industry that it represents.

It hardly seems necessary for me to lecture a distinguished group such as this—educators, scientists, representatives of agri-business, students and members of the Paul A. Funk family. You are the people who are making this industry work. But I would like to take a brief look at some of the things we have attained in the past, where we're heading in the future, and where the responsibilities in this endeavor rest.

George Bernard Shaw once wrote (and I quote): "Science is always wrong. It never solves a problem without creating ten more."

I don't view the role of science quite the way Mr. Shaw did...and, of course, you don't either. Where Mr. Shaw went wrong was in assuming that science solves problems. Instead, I say it tackles challenges! And yes—as it conquers that challenge, it also creates ten more challenges.

If this were not so, we would never have doubled our soybean yields from what they were in the 30's. We wouldn't be producing five times the amount of corn in states like Illinois.

What has happened in Illinois has happened throughout the nation. Yields and production of major crops and animals have increased steadily...some jumped miraculously...leading the U.S. to its current position of being the world's greatest producer.

Our universities have played a prominent role in this. Some of the early research on hybrid corn was accomplished right here at U of I. Illinois and other Corn Belt universities made the concept work. And the adoption of hybrid corn by farmers was spurred by Extension agents who demonstrated its value...and preached about its potential.

University and federal scientists were also first to realize the potential of the soybean. They faced the challenge of making the original germplasm from China satisfactory for conditions in this country. They conquered the challenge! Our present day soybean is now tailor-made for U.S. farms—so much that it now competes with corn as the nation's and Illinois' number-one crop.

Our gains in hog and cattle production would not have been possible without the challenges we tackled in genetics, crossbreeding and nutrition studies...not to mention the breeding improvement programs initiated by the Cooperative Extension Services.

The benefits that agriculture has gained from the ability of science and education to face challenges are endless. Just look at what we have accomplished in our control or eradication of diseases and insect pests. Hog cholera has been conquered...losses to Marek's disease in poultry have been reduced by 90 percent...the serious threat of corn blight has been overcome, and the University of Illinois scientists had a key role in this effort.

Agricultural research has also made significant changes in the supplies of safe and nutritious foods available to consumers. Our studies

have improved methods of preservation, handling, transportation and storage. There is only one reason why a person can walk through a supermarket today and find shelves of fresh, canned, frozen and dried products. It is because people across the country, in Universities and on the farm, have had the courage to face challenges--rather than abandon them as problems.

Our agricultural science and education system has no doubt established one of the greatest track records to be witnessed anywhere. I attribute this to the cooperative effort...the unique cooperative effort in the state, federal and private sector.

We have created a system that I believe in very strongly. In fact, one of the top goals...one of the highest priorities I have established for the Department of Agriculture is to maintain our agricultural capacity through science and education. This is something that I reaffirmed recently when I testified before the House Committee on Agriculture.

As I tell the story of agriculture in Washington, D.C., I never fail to emphasize that science and education have been the very foundation of all that we have attained in American agriculture.

The point that I continue to make is very simple...yet very significant: Science and education provide even more than just the foundation for excellence in agriculture. They also fuel us with a perpetual energy. If it were ever weakened...or worse still, eliminated...American agriculture would begin to slide just as rapidly as science and education allowed it to advance.

Now, very briefly, let's look at our various roles within this science and education system. Then we'll take a look up the road to see where we're headed.

Besides the many contributions that are already being made by the Universities, we must always remember that their essential task is to educate future farmers, scientists, extension specialists, future agribusiness leaders, and all others whom this nation will depend upon for maintaining stability in agriculture.

The experiment stations will continue to perform basic and applied research, solve state and regional problems, facilitate federal research, and aid in training students.

Our federal research service will concentrate on national and basic research problems, but they will be working closely with the experiment stations in regional research.

The Extension Service will continue to provide the essential link between research and its application...while private industry will carry out commercial development of research results, as well as engaging in its own research.

We all know that our rate of growth in plant and animal productivity has leveled off in recent years. I prefer to think that we have reached a peak— but we have not peaked. There are still other mountains to be climbed, and there always will be as long as we have the courage to move forward.

It is more important now than ever before to invest in fundamental productivity research. We have to address the long-term challenges of productivity growth and resource use so that U.S. agriculture can continue to be a reliable long-term supplier.

Just this past year, I announced the development...through genetic engineering...of a vaccine for foot and mouth disease. I am certain that we are all aware of the importance attached to this breakthrough. In fact, some observers have called genetic engineering the new revolution in science.

A second breakthrough in genetic engineering...also announced last year...was the development of a technology for moving genes from one kind of plant to another. Basic discoveries of this nature could lay the groundwork for major improvements in crops and livestock.

Closely allied to this work in genetics is the need to maintain and increase our germplasm base. USDA, the States, private foundations, and industry are cooperating in this effort through the National Plant Germplasm System.

We will also need continued efforts and more fundamental research on soil erosion and water conservation to conserve our resources, yet maintain our agricultural productivity. These are the two greatest problems and challenges in agriculture today.

The promises of conservation tillage have caused farmers in Illinois and across the nation to adopt new practices. But much more still needs to be done in research to develop the technology needed for adaptable

farm machinery, weed and pest controls, and fertilizer application to maintain yields.

I have no doubt that we will be seeing many new approaches in science and education—approaches that will lift agricultural productivity from its present plateau.

Just look at some of the new approaches already being examined:

- Using hormone techniques to produce pig litters in 4 1/2 months rather than 6 1/2.

- Implanting embryos in cows to double calf production.

- Using remote sensing, computers, radar and other techniques to determine crop moisture, fertilizer or pesticide needs.

Those areas that were mysteries yesterday, are becoming realities today...and that's what makes science and education so exciting. That's the beauty of agriculture. We are always unveiling more and more mysteries of nature...and finding new mysteries along the way.

Why are we doing all of this?

Certainly, we want to maintain stability and encourage prosperity in rural America. But the real reasons go far beyond our own livelihoods.

Look at it this way: Last year we in agriculture produced 30 bushels of corn for every American. That's not going to be enough in the future. Our country's population is growing at a rate of 5,500 people a day.

We export more vast amounts of food and fiber every year...but more will have to be exported in the future. The world's population is growing by nearly 300,000 people a day.

There are many areas we can discuss in agriculture today—but when you get to the real basics, we're really talking about an endless rise in the number of mouths that will have to be fed...people that will have to be clothed.

We can't let up! We cannot ever stop planning for the future! And we won't...not as long as we have universities such as this one, and people dedicated to making them work.

It has been said that the very first thing education teaches you is to walk upright; the second to move forward. You are doing that, and you

have a right to be proud of your accomplishments. Keep up the good work.

#

Remarks prepared for delivery by Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block at the Western States Dairy Conference, in Seattle, Washington, March 3, 1982

I really appreciate having this opportunity to speak with you here today in Seattle. And thank you for that kind welcome. It reminds me of an observation made by President Reagan when he was speaking in Washington. He entered the room...there was a great amount of applause, of course...and then he reminded the audience that all public speakers share one common thought: They hope they get as much applause after they've finished talking.

There's a reason why I say that today. You see, nothing would make me happier than to stand up here and talk about what a tremendous job we're all doing in getting dairy production back into line with demands. In fact, nothing would make me happier than to see the day when there's a glass of wholesome milk in front of every person...at every table...and at every meal of the day. I'm certain the American public is learning more every day about the nutritional value of dairy products, and we have to maintain our educational efforts in that respect. I'm also certain that you, as responsible dairy producers, also share my vision of the day when we can put all of our problems behind us.

But you also realize that we've got a lot of work to do before that day comes and...quite frankly...we aren't even headed in the right direction yet!

That means we have some serious matters to talk about. In fact, let me take it a step past that—we have some urgent matters to talk about today!

So, let's use this opportunity right now to face the problem squarely...examine some figures that are not too friendly...and then lay some groundwork for a cooperative effort to find a solution.

So that none of you misunderstand the direction that I'm coming from, let me make it clear right now that I support the need for a dairy price support program...as long as it achieves what it was intended to do...and nothing more. It's imperative that we have some type of structure that guarantees consumers an adequate supply of dairy products at reasonable prices, while providing producers a fair return.

A dairy program that would attain these goals has to be considered a friend...a friend to the consumer and a friend to the producer. But we all know what happened. The figures that are before us today are not friendly—they are the enemy, and they have to be dealt with accordingly.

I'm talking about a quarter of a million dollars! Not every month...or week...or day! The taxpayers of this country are giving the dairy industry a quarter of a million dollars every hour—twenty-four hours a day. This is embarrassing...it's unacceptable—ladies and gentlemen...it's intolerable! It cannot continue!

I doubt very much whether the authors of this program could have ever envisioned what was going to happen. Could they ever have envisioned that by 1982 this country would be spending that kind of money...for what?...to build a storage of more than a billion and a half pounds of dairy products, growing so rapidly that we can't give it away fast enough.

And that's what makes this whole situation so intolerable. I could face these costs with much more ease if I knew that something was being done about it...that things were moving in the right direction. But that's not the case. Even with the revisions that were made in the program within the past year—production continues up...three percent from a year ago...demand is flat...and the taxpayer is forced to buy the difference.

Right now our uncommitted inventory contains 290 million pounds of butter, 581 million pounds of cheese and 920 million pounds of non-fat dry milk. Our storage costs are running about \$42.5 million per year at those current inventory levels...but let me remind you...those levels are growing. Even with the distribution of 100 million pounds to needy people around the country, we still expect our cheese surplus to grow 200 million pounds by September 1, over what it was a year earlier.

We also need to face the fact that the western states must share their fair responsibility for this problem. Our figures show that the western states have increased their share of the total CCC purchases of butter and non-fat dry milk over the past 10 years.

California alone accounted for 24 percent of CCC butter purchases last year...and 26 percent of the dry milk purchases. Four western states—and I'm referring to California, Idaho, Oregon and Washington—accounted for 31 percent of our total CCC butter purchases and 38 percent of our non-fat dry milk purchases last year. These figures are up from 14 percent for each product compared to 10 years ago.

Between October 1 last year and Feb. 19 this year, our purchases of butter were up 6 percent from the same period a year earlier. Cheese purchases increased 17 percent, and non-fat dry milk...45 percent. I know that feed is cheap now and cull-cow prices are weak...so we seem to have an incentive for increasing production.

The philosophy is to make the money while we can, pay for those investments... then we can ease off and face the problems later. The trouble is that we are only adding to the problem...we're making it much bigger...and we may be approaching a day of reckoning that could be too much for us to handle.

Now don't let that statement pass over too quickly. There are those in Washington who are not too sympathetic with the dairy industry. They would like to do away with the dairy program altogether, not realizing the consequences of such an action. Fortunately, they are small in number yet...but I am deeply concerned that their numbers will grow sharply when our continued inability to deal with the problem becomes widely known.

As you know, the Administration fought hard for a reduction in support levels to deal with this problem. We fought for them because we knew they were in the best long-term interest of the dairy industry. In our minds, there was no question of our intent.

We were successful in receiving some reductions. And by our estimates, we felt that we were turning the corner and would have the dairy industry headed in the right direction—a direction in which it would eventually find stability in the market place rather than with government dollars.

It didn't work out that way! Our estimates were wrong! And the estimates by Congress and the dairy industry were even further off. We've already heard the figures. But let me tell you—it is becoming increasingly difficult to defend the basic intent of this program when we are not moving within the industry itself to correct the situation.

We're losing our grip! We have to face the cold, hard facts. We have to attack the problem from within! We have to discipline ourselves, because if we don't...

Well—let's talk about the solutions. Let's lay the groundwork for our attack... consider the options...and then move to take some positive action.

Do we sell part of the inventory on export markets for what it will bring in a competitive situation—about 20 to 50 percent of our purchase price?

Do we expand our dairy gifts to the needy people of the world...including those in this country...and receive little or no reimbursement?

Do we continue to store the surplus in hopes that our domestic commercial markets will absorb it in the near future?

Do we consider changes in fluid milk standards in order to utilize more solids-nonfat ...similar to the current practice in California.

Unfortunately, the export market is a poor alternative...and for a very good reason. First, our prices are substantially above the world market price. Secondly, our administration has been working with great determination to reduce trade barriers, and to convince other nations that they should not subsidize their products sold on the world market.

The distribution of dairy products to needy people is also a poor long-term alternative. Our recent move to expand this distribution in cooperation with State agencies and non-profit groups has been an effective method of distribution. But it is not effective in reducing our surpluses.

As for waiting for the domestic market to absorb the surplus...it would not be facing the reality of the situation.

The fact is...none of the above alternatives provide the overall solution for the real problem. The reality of the situation is that currently we have over one million too many cows—and there's only one way we're going to cure that problem. We're going to have to make

a voluntary effort to cut back production. I'm not just talking about two, three or four percent. We've got 10 percent too much right now, and we need to start disciplining ourselves before someone else does it for us.

Granted...we aren't going to come up with any solutions today. But I do want you to start thinking about it...and think about it seriously.

I am announcing today that I have directed my chief economist, Assistant Secretary Bill Leshner, to schedule a Dairy Economics Symposium later this month in a central location. His assignment is to obtain information, from a wide range of people, about how we can bring this program under control. No decisions will be made at the conference itself, but we're going to use the input we receive to make specific recommendations to Congress about what further changes should be made in the program. We'll be contacting your industry soon with more details on the meeting.

I encourage you to join together and help us attack the problem...and help us show the doubters that this industry is willing to take matters into its own hands.

We're going to do it, because that's the way agriculture is. We've all learned a harsh lesson from history that the solution is not to sit back and hope that the government—already too big—will lead us up that golden path to prosperity. We will not condemn ourselves to relive that kind of history.

Certainly, it would be much easier for us to help ourselves in the dairy industry if the state of the general economy were in better shape. But if it were easy...then there wouldn't be a problem.

President Reagan is doing a lot of things now that agriculture has asked him to do for a long time. And what he's doing makes sense. It makes sense to cut taxes and let us invest more of our money...to reduce the strangle-hold of regulation...and to slice away at government spending. And if we have the patience to allow it to happen—then his economic recovery will work. I have no doubt about that.

But the dairy industry cannot afford to wait for this to happen. To do that, you would be working against the recovery...to the tune of a quarter-million dollars every hour. But if you take the initiative now...if you plan your attack and discipline yourselves to stick with it—then you'll be part of the nation's recovery.

We in agriculture have to chart our own destiny...and we have to fight to make it happen.

Thank you.

#

Testimony

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Governmental and Public Affairs

Statement By Seeley Lodwick, Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs, United States Department of Agriculture, before the Senate Committee on Finance, Subcommittee on International Trade, March 1, 1982

A basic U.S. objective at the GATT Ministerial will be to establish a work program for the 1980's aimed at bringing about further trade liberalization.

At this point, it is our view that agriculture should be a full participant in that program.

There are, for example, problems with the existing rules on subsidies that go beyond agriculture. The United States would like a stronger discipline over some kinds of research and development activities. We need clearer rules on the obligations to be undertaken by developing countries. All of these problems related to the GATT Subsidies Code, so it makes sense to talk about them together.

Or take the case of standards, where we are concerned that the existing code be recognized to cover problems tied to production methods as well as products. While this is an important problem for agriculture, it affects industry too.

The GATT Secretariat has made a study of all the ways existing GATT rules apply to agriculture and how those rules are different from the rules that apply to industrial products. It has been suggested that we review this study to see to what extent countries are willing to narrow the gap between agricultural and industrial rules.

It seems to us that a more productive approach would be to examine the rules where the problems are. That is, if we can reach agreement to do so, it would be better to deal with agriculture as an important aspect of other issues on the agenda—subsidies, standards, safeguards and so on.

While nothing has yet been agreed on in Geneva as to procedures, the most commonly expressed view is that there ought to be an agriculture committee. Such a committee would look at national agricultural policies to expose their impact on international trade, and

look at GATT rules on trade in agricultural products and see where the rules can be strengthened.

If this Agriculture Committee became the center of negotiations regarding problems in agricultural trade, or if it were used as a shield to bar consideration of agricultural trade problems in other committees, such as a subsidies committee, we believe that the United States would get bogged down, as it has before, in an unproductive exercise in discussion.

We have had agriculture committees before in the GATT. They have examined national policies and they have catalogued problems discussed.

In short, we would be better off attempting to solve problems topic by topic not by saying: "Agriculture is a problem." Agriculture is not a problem; it has problems as do other sectors.

#

News Releases

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Governmental and Public Affairs

STATE SHARES OF 1982 NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM REVENUES ESTIMATED AT \$205 MILLION

WASHINGTON, March 1—Almost \$205 million will be divided among 43 states and Puerto Rico as their shares of 1982 national forest system receipts, according to estimates released today by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

R. Max Peterson, chief of USDA's Forest Service, said 25 percent of the total revenues collected for timber sales, grazing permits, recreation fees, mineral leases and land use charges on the 191 million acres of national forests, national grasslands and land utilization projects in 1982, will be returned to the states where the Forest Service-administered lands are located.

The funds will be used for public schools and roads.

Peterson said advance estimates of the state payments are being made now to help in local budget planning, explaining that, "the payments will be based on actual receipts collected, and may vary from the estimates announced today."

Interim payments of state shares of national forest receipts will be made in October 1982, Peterson said. The balance will be paid in December, when final figures on the revenues collected during fiscal year 1982 are available.

The states' shares of the national grassland and land utilization project receipts, based on revenues collected during calendar year 1982, will be paid in March 1983.

States received \$243.4 million as their shares of fiscal year 1981 national forest revenues and calendar year 1981 national grassland and land utilization project revenues.

State by state, the estimated payments will be:

State	National Forests	National Grasslands & Land Utilization Projects
Alabama	\$1,468,250.01	
Alaska	3,778,750.02	
Arizona	3,663,245.79	
Arkansas	3,613,837.82	\$2,587.50
California	35,400,053.38	390.25
Colorado	1,842,826.62	82,842.25
Florida	1,513,750.01	55,000.00
Georgia	993,000.04	
Idaho	8,531,904.73	5,287.75
Illinois	99,000.02	
Indiana	115,500.01	
Kansas		55,687.50
Kentucky	207,922.63	
Louisiana	1,817,250.00	
Maine	18,496.59	
Maryland		1,625.00
Michigan	808,600.08	121,225.00
Minnesota	1,136,548.56	
Mississippi	5,064,382.57	112.50
Missouri	2,819,750.04	625.00
Montana	8,103,952.80	
Nebraska	38,212.50	30,125.00
Nevada	290,115.98	
New Hampshire	275,853.47	
New Mexico	1,741,823.23	
New York		12,600.00
North Carolina	627,111.16	
North Dakota	64.22	10,216,144.83
Ohio	96,750.01	450.00
Oklahoma	506,758.73	259,529.29
Oregon	72,273,732.77	9,150.00
Pennsylvania	874,750.01	

Table continued from previous page

State	National Forests	National Grasslands & Land Utilization Projects
South Carolina	2,889,750.04	
South Dakota	499,630.43	198,884.91
Tennessee	211,888.90	
Texas	1,497,250.01	122,687.71
Utah	799,729.03	
Vermont	89,750.06	
Virginia	402,609.79	
Washington	27,348,618.50	
West Virginia	316,792.67	
Wisconsin	499,000.02	
Wyoming	879,896.04	401,875.00
Puerto Rico	7,500.01	
Totals	\$193,164,609.30	\$11,603,204.49

#

BLOCK NAMES NEW FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE ADMINISTRATOR

Champaign-Urbana, Ill., March 1—Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block announced today he has selected Samuel J. Cornelius to be administrator of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service. Cornelius will assume his duties March 8.

Block made the announcement while visiting the University of Illinois.

The Food and Nutrition Service, one of USDA's largest agencies, administers the food stamp program and other nutrition assistance programs.

Cornelius succeeds Gene P. Dickey, who served as acting FNS administrator while on leave from his post as administrator of the agency's southwest regional office.

Cornelius has been at the White House in the Office of Presidential Personnel since last November. In April 1981 he was named deputy director of the Community Services Administration.

Cornelius served in President Ford's administration as deputy director, Office of Minority Business Enterprise, U.S. Department of Commerce. He resigned in March 1977 to enter private business. In November 1979, he took leave from his privately-owned business, Cornelius-Wiggins Internationale, Inc., to develop the Economic Development Assistance Center for Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America.

Born in Kansas City, Mo., April 14, 1928, Cornelius is a graduate of Anderson College, Anderson, Ind. He has been vice president of the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and a member of the steering committee of Opportunities Industrialization Centers, the Metropolitan Board of Directors of Kansas City Young Men's Christian Association, the United Fund and United Black Fund.

#

CCC LOAN INTEREST RATE INCREASED

WASHINGTON, March 1—Commodity and farm storage facility loans disbursed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation during March will have a 14.875 percent interest rate, according to CCC Executive Vice President Everett Rank.

The new rate, up from 14 percent in February, reflects the interest rate charged CCC by the U.S. Treasury in March, Rank said.

#

USDA PROTECTS 16 NEW SEED VARIETIES

WASHINGTON, March 2—The U.S. Department of Agriculture has issued certificates of protection for new varieties of alfalfa, garden bean, soybean and common wheat.

Thomas H. Porter, an official with USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service, said that owners of the new varieties will have the exclusive right to reproduce their products in the United States for 18 years. Certificates of protection are granted, he said, after a review of the breeders' records and their claims that each new variety is novel, uniform and stable.

Among the newly protected varieties are Magnum alfalfa, developed by Dairyland Seed Co., Inc., West Bend, Wis., and Blue Duet garden bean, developed by Moran Seeds, Inc., Salinas, Calif.

Newly protected soybean varieties are: J-112, developed by Jacques Seed Co., Prescott, Wis.; Deltapine 506 and Deltapine 105, developed by Delta and Pine Land Co., Scott, Miss.; and SRF 101, developed by the Soybean Research Foundation, Inc., Mason City, Ill.

Also protected were ten varieties of common wheat. They are Southern Belle by Coker's Pedigreed Seed Co., Hartsville, S.C.; Augusta and Frankenmuth by Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station, E. Lansing, Mich.; PL145 and PR2360 by Pioneer Hi-Bred International, Inc., Hutchinson, Kan.; Tut by Leo Linden Schraeder, Timken, Kan.; Brawny, Citation and Encore by the Seed Research Division of Agrigenetics, Scott City, Kan.; and Archer by North American Plant Breeders, Mission, Kan.

The Magnum alfalfa, SRF 101 soybean and all varieties of common wheat except PL145 will be sold by variety name only as a class of certified seed.

The plant variety protection program is administered by USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service. It provides marketing protection to developers of new and distinctive seed-reproduced plants ranging from farm crops to flowers.

#

300 YOUTHS AND ADULTS TO HELP CHART FUTURE DIRECTIONS OF 4-H

WASHINGTON, March 2—Some 300 youngsters and adults will come to Washington March 27-April 2 to exchange views and help chart directions the nation's 4-H clubs will take in the years ahead.

Delegates will speak for about 5 million boys and girls at the 52nd National 4-H Conference in the National 4-H Center, 7100 Connecticut Ave., N.W.

"Before making their recommendations on the programs 4-H will emphasize in the future, the delegates will meet in groups to discuss a broad range of topics," said Eugene (Pete) Williams, deputy administrator for 4-H youth programs in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Extension Service.

Williams said the agenda centers around this year's national theme—"4-H Pathways to the Future."

Sue Block, wife of Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block, will make the keynote address at the opening session March 27, and the Secretary plans to attend one or more of the meetings. Both are former 4-H'ers.

Cooperative Extension Services, headquartered at the country's land-grant universities and colleges in the states, and USDA's Extension Service cooperate with local governments in administering 4-H work throughout the nation and its territories.

The delegates will include teen-age 4-H youths, adult volunteer leaders who work for 4-H without monetary pay, and Cooperative Extension staff members from 46 states, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia.

Besides the millions of young people, delegates will represent nearly 600,000 adult 4-H volunteer leaders. Canada also will send delegates as part of 4-H's international exchange efforts.

Williams said the delegates will divide into teams to analyze different 4-H endeavors. One group will look for ways to strengthen 4-H contributions to agricultural production and marketing. Another will talk about how to develop a computer project for 4-H boys and girls and other uses of computers in 4-H.

Teams also will explore new leadership styles and skills for adult volunteers; keeping teenagers involved in 4-H longer; expanding 4-H

international programs; involving 4-H at all levels of government, making 4-H available to all people, including such special audiences as the handicapped; helping youngsters better explore jobs and careers; and conserving the country's heritage, resources, beauty and freedoms.

Highlights of the week include a meeting of the delegates at the USDA to discuss today's agricultural issues and to view a 4-H photo exhibit sponsored by Eastman Kodak Company. The exhibit will be open to the public that week in the patio area on the first floor of USDA's Administration Building facing the Mall at 14th Street and Independence Avenue.

April 1 will be "4-H Day on Capitol Hill," when delegates will meet with members of Congress and watch the lawmakers in action.

Cultural events for the week include theater and dance performances and a "night view" bus tour of Washington.

"After the conference ends," Williams said, "the 4-H members and leaders will return to their communities and tell the people back home about the work they did at the meeting in Washington and what it all can mean to local groups."

The annual conference is conducted by USDA's Extension Service, the Cooperative Extension Services of the nation's land-grant universities and colleges, and the National 4-H Council.

#

ESTHER WINTERFELDT TO HEAD HUMAN NUTRITION INFORMATION SERVICE

SAN DIEGO, Calif., March 2—Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block announced today he has selected Esther Winterfeldt as administrator of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Human Nutrition Information Service. She will assume her duties March 8.

Winterfeldt has been professor and head of the food, nutrition and institution administration of the College of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, since 1970.

The Human Nutrition Information Service was created by USDA in 1981 to better disseminate nutrition information to the public. Winterfeldt will be the first permanent head of the agency.

Winterfeldt was a nutrition and food scientist for USDA, working under a 10-month inter-personnel agreement, 1978-79.

From 1960-67, Winterfeldt was director of dietetics for the University Hospitals, Ohio State University, Columbus. She was assistant chief dietitian and internship director for the University of Chicago Hospitals 1957-60. She was the administrative dietitian for the University of Chicago Hospitals from 1952-56 and chief dietitian of Children's Hospital, Louisville, Ky., 1949-52.

Winterfeldt received her bachelor's and master's degrees from Oklahoma State University and her Ph.D. from the Ohio State University. She was president of the American Dietetic Assoc. 1979-80 and has held other offices in the organization. She is a member of Phi Kappa Phi, Omicron Nu, Phi Upsilon Omicron, Mortar Board and Phi Sigma. She has published numerous papers on diet and nutrition and appeared on radio and television shows as an expert on human nutrition.

#

USDA TO ASSESS IMPACT OF TRANSPORTATION DEREGULATION ON AGRICULTURE

WASHINGTON, March 3—Transportation specialists from the U.S. Department of Agriculture and land-grant universities will assess the impact that transportation deregulation will have on agriculture, according to Martin F. Fitzpatrick, director of USDA's Office of Transportation.

Some of the areas to be evaluated include rail rate and services discrimination among agricultural shippers and receivers; rail rate flexibility, including contracting, surcharges and adequate notice; and certain provisions of the motor carrier act. Fitzpatrick said the assessment is expected to be completed by early summer.

"This will be the first extensive, objective study of the impacts on agriculture of deregulation based on the Staggers Rail Act and the Motor Carrier Act of 1980," Fitzpatrick said. "In initiating this assessment, the Office of Transportation is fulfilling its role as the voice of rural transportation.

"The results of this assessment will be used by Congress, farm groups and administration policymakers in their deliberations on the appropriate adjustments needed in transportation policy that will benefit agricultural shippers, as well as presenting an objective and timely picture of the current state of agricultural transportation."

Non-USDA team members are: C. Phillip Baumel of Iowa State University; Harold F. Breimyer of the University of Missouri; Stanley K. Seaver of the University of Connecticut; Marc A. Johnson of North Carolina State University; Kenneth L. Casavant of Washington State University; Gene C. Griffin of the Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute, North Dakota State University; L. Orlo Sorenson of Kansas State University; and James H. Lauth, private consultant of Bowie, Md.

#

DAIRY SYMPOSIUM SET FOR MARCH 22 - 23

SEATTLE, Wash., March 3—Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block today announced a public dairy symposium March 22-23 at the Marriott Hotel in Kansas City, Mo., to gather input for drafting recommendations to Congress about changes in the dairy price support program.

Block's announcement came during his address to the Western States Dairy Conference here.

"No final decisions will be made during the symposium," Block said. "Our goal is to gather input from a wide range of knowledgeable people about how we can tackle the severe problem of dairy surplus and the increasing costs of government support payments."

Under the current program, USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation purchases surplus dairy products to maintain a price level established by Congress. The intent of the program is to guarantee consumers an adequate supply at reasonable prices, while providing producers a fair return.

But Block said the current uncommitted CCC inventory contains 290 million pounds of butter, 581 million pounds of cheese and 920 million pounds of non-fat dry milk. This surplus inventory is still growing, he said.

"Even with the program revisions made within the past year—production is up, demand is flat and the taxpayer is forced to buy the difference," Block said. "This is embarrassing, unacceptable and intolerable. It cannot continue."

Assistant Secretary William G. Lesher is organizing the symposium under Block's direction. He said Deputy Secretary of Agriculture Richard E. Lyng will kick off the first session, which will focus on the supply and demand situation facing the industry over the next two years. The second day will be devoted to exploring options on how the current dairy situation can be improved, Lesher said.

Persons interested in addressing the symposium should contact Alden Manchester of USDA's Economic Research Service at (202) 447-8833. Reservations should be made directly with the hotel by calling (816) 464-2200 and indicating attendance at the symposium.

#

KHAPRA BEETLE INFESTATION FOUND IN NEW JERSEY WAREHOUSE

WASHINGTON, March 4—The khapra beetle, one of the world's worst pests of stored grains and cereal products, has been found in a New Jersey warehouse by U.S. Department of Agriculture quarantine inspectors.

Ronald Johnson, a plant protection official of USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, said khapra beetle larvae were found in an American Terminal Corporation warehouse in South Kearney, N.J., in the New York port area.

According to Johnson, the infestation was discovered in the course of an on-going USDA surveillance program for this pest.

The 82 by 332-foot, one story New Jersey warehouse will be fumigated to eliminate the pest, Johnson said. "This is the method used to eliminate most previous infestations," he said. "Where fumigation is not practical, infested areas are intensively sanitized and treated with insecticide."

The building is used to store spice and coffee. Although khapra beetles do not feed on these products, they are sometimes carried from

their countries of origin in crevices and corners of the burlap bagging used to ship different types of cargo.

"Khapra beetles favor dark areas, so we have to look very carefully for the pest in bagging and crates from infested countries," Johnson said.

This is the first confirmed khapra beetle infestation in the United States since inspectors found the insect in an empty Port Authority warehouse at Newark, N.J., in December 1981. During late 1980 and through December 1981, inspectors found 21 separate infestations in the United States in the course of an intensive survey of high risk sites.

The khapra beetle, which is found in India and certain other Asian countries, causes millions of dollars of damage worldwide each year to stored grains and cereal products.

#

USDA TO END 24-HOUR INFOLINE REPORTING TEST APRIL 1

WASHINGTON, March 5—A U.S. Department of Agriculture test that provides market news reports on a variety of commodities for a 50-cent direct-dial telephone call will be discontinued April 1.

The service, called InfoLine, is a test project conducted by USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service in cooperation with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company at no cost to the government. Mildred Thymian, administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, said the test will be discontinued because of insufficient public use. She said AMS may consider testing InfoLine again in the future.

Thymian said the regular instant market reports on commodities will continue to be available from AMS. The instant market reporting service, utilizing automatic recording devices, provides current market information on selected commodities by telephone from local market news offices throughout the country.

Telephone numbers for instant market reports are listed in local phone directories under "U.S. Government—U.S. Department of Agriculture."

The numbers for each commodity throughout the nation are listed in "Facts About Instant Market News," AMS-572, available from Information Division, AMS, Rm. 2638-A, USDA, Washington, D.C. 20250.

#

USDA RELEASES COST OF FOOD AT HOME FOR JANUARY 1982

WASHINGTON, March 5—The U.S. Department of Agriculture today released its monthly update of the weekly cost of food at home for January 1982.

USDA's Human Nutrition Information Service computes the cost of food at home for four food plans—thrifty, low-cost, moderate-cost and liberal.

Betty Peterkin, a home economist with the Human Nutrition Information Service, said the plans consist of foods that together provide well-balanced meals and snacks for a week.

USDA assumes all food is bought at the store and fixed at home. Costs do not include alcoholic beverages, pet food, soap, cigarettes, paper goods and other nonfood items bought at the store.

"USDA costs are only guides to spending," Peterkin said. "Families may spend more or less, depending on such factors as where they buy their food, how carefully they plan and buy, whether some food is produced at home, what foods the family likes and how much food is prepared at home.

"Most families will find the moderate-cost or low-cost plan suitable," she said. "The thrifty plan, which USDA uses to set the coupon allotment in the food stamp program, is for families with less money for food. Families with unlimited resources might use the liberal plan."

Details of the four food plans are described in Home and Garden Bulletin No. 94, "Family Food Budgeting. . .for Good Meals and Good Nutrition," which may be purchased for \$2 each from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

COST OF FOOD AT HOME FOR A WEEK IN JANUARY 1982

	Plans			
	Thrifty	Low-cost	Moderate-cost	Liberal
Families:				
Family of 2 (20-54 years)	\$33.50	\$43.30	\$54.20	\$64.90
Family of 2 (55 years and over)	30.30	38.80	48.00	57.30
Family of 4 with preschool children	47.70	60.90	75.90	90.80
Family of 4 with elementary school children	57.50	73.80	92.30	110.40
Individuals in four-person families:				
Children:				
1-2 years	7.80	9.80	12.10	14.40
3-5 years	9.40	11.70	14.50	17.40
6-8 years	12.00	15.30	19.10	22.80
9-11 years	15.00	19.10	23.90	28.60
Females:				
12-19 years	14.20	18.10	22.30	26.60
20-54 years	13.70	17.60	21.90	26.10
55 and over	12.50	16.00	19.70	23.40
Males:				
12-14 years	16.00	20.20	25.20	30.10
15-19 years	17.50	22.20	27.80	33.40
20-54 years	16.80	21.80	27.40	32.90
55 and over	15.00	19.30	23.90	28.70

To estimate your family food costs

—For members eating all meals at home—or carried from home—use the amounts shown.

—For members eating some meals out, deduct 5 percent from the amount shown for each meal not eaten at home. Thus, for a person

eating lunch out five days a week, subtract 25 percent, or one-fourth the cost shown.

—For guests, add 5 percent of the amount shown for the proper age group for each meal.

Costs in the second part of the chart are for individuals in four-person families. If your family has more or less than four, total the "individual" figures and make these adjustments, because larger families tend to buy and use food more economically than smaller ones:

- For a one-person family, add 20 percent.
- For a two-person family, add 10 percent.
- For a three-person family, add 5 percent.
- For a family of five or six persons, subtract 5 percent.
- For a family of seven or more, subtract 10 percent.

#

